

Remarks

Applicant has amended claims 1, 6, 17, 19, 22 and 24; and cancelled claims 7 and 25-32. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter was added by the amendment, as all of the amended matter was either previously illustrated or described in the drawings, written specification and/or claims of the present application. (See, Pars. 42, 43 & 46 where the program overwrites and existing program). Entry of the amendment and favorable consideration thereof is earnestly requested.

As amended all the claims recite that the detachable configurable component includes a processor that the processor receives a program that overwrites an existing program on the processor, where the processor configures the detachable configurable component for processing the image data. Therefore, the processor that receives the program and configures the detachable configurable component is also detachable. The Examiner has submitted that U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0141054 (Mochida et al.) "discloses a detachable configurable component which comprises a processor (Figure 28, Item 452)" and that "Mochida in view of [U.S. Patent No. 5,627,583 (Nakamura et al.)] Nakamura discloses a processor which receives and executes a program (i.e. circuit data; Nakamura, c. 4, ll. 5-57)." (Official Action, 7/17/07 p. 12) Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Mochida et al. discloses use of "field programmable gate arrays (hereinafter FPGA)." (Par. 229) Mochida et al. further discloses that "control unit 44 loads any data into the FPGA 452 according to the identification number, and thus finalizes a facility to be realized with the internal circuit of the FPGA 452." (Par. 237) When viewing Figure 28 to which the description in paragraph 237 applies, one can see that "control unit 44" is an integral part of "main substrate 7" whereas "FPGA 452" is situated on "expansion substrate 451 and is coupled to "main substrate 7" via "expansion connector 35." (See, FIGS 1 & 28; Pars. 145, 229-237) Mochida et al. cannot be modified according to the

pending claims either. For example, Mochida et al. teaches that “[w]hen an address assigned to the identification signal generation unit 75 is designated, the identification signal generation unit 75 transmits an identification signal to the control unit on the main substrate 7 over an identification signal line 76. The control unit 44 identifies the connected expansion substrates and detects the number of connected expansion substrates, and controls the expansion substrates according to the results of the identification and detection.” (Par. 156) (emphasis added) Accordingly, if one were to try to move the control unit 44 onto an expansion substrate, it is questionable whether or not the system would have means of communicating addresses. In any event, even if communication were possible, if the particular expansion substrate with the control unit relocated thereon was removed, the system would not function with the remaining expansion substrates. See, MPEP 2143.01; *In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ2d 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (if the proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification.) Applicant respectfully submits that in the present case, if one were to relocate the control unit 44 to one of the expansion substrates, the system would not have the flexibility to freely add and remove expansion substrates. Alternatively, to it is questionable whether providing a control unit 44 on every expansion substrate would work as multiple control units would create confusion, and, in any event, would greatly increase the cost and complexity of the system.

Accordingly, because neither Mochida et al. nor Nakamura et al. teach or disclose a camera control unit having a detachable configurable comprising a processor, and that the processor receives a program and overwriting an existing program on said processor, where the processor configures the detachable configurable component for processing the image data, neither reference can render the pending claims obvious. In addition, because Mochida et al. actually teaches away from modification according to the presently pending claims, such a modification cannot be considered obvious.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-4 and 6-24, all of the claims remaining in the application, are in order for allowance and early notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

September 13, 2007

/Wesley W. Whitmyer, Jr./
Wesley W. Whitmyer, Jr., Registration No. 33,558
Steven B. Simonis, Registration No. 54,449
Attorneys for Applicants
ST. ONGE STEWARD JOHNSTON & REENS LLC
986 Bedford Street
Stamford, CT 06905-5619
Tel. 203 324-6155